



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

numerous cases from other jurisdictions. We have examined a large number of the authorities cited, and some of them may not be in entire accord with the conclusion reached by us in this case; but conditions have changed greatly since many of the cited cases were decided. The immense increase in the cost of living and in all the necessities of life must be, to some extent, taken into consideration in determining whether the verdict was in fact excessive. It may be that plaintiff will entirely recover, and suffer little or no permanent impairment of his health, comfort, or earning capacity; but, under the evidence, the jury could have reasonably found otherwise. The question was, peculiarly for the jury, and we do not feel that same should be interfered with by this court."

Fires—Failure of Railroad Company to Aid in Extinguishing Fire Set by Engine.—In *Ginter v. Pennsylvania R. Co.*, 262 Pa. St. 474, 105 Atl. 824, 3 A. L. R. 505, it was held that where fire started on land contiguous to railroad's coal branch, but not on its right of way, and not from any negligent operation of its trains, and extended to land beyond and set fire to timber, railroad was not bound to aid in extinguishing fire, and was not liable for negligence of crew in refusing to aid.

The court said: "We are, therefore, of the opinion that in the case at bar the defendant company cannot be held guilty of negligence because of the failure of its crew to leave their trains and engage in the work of extinguishing the fire started on lands adjoining its right of way. To enforce this measure of duty would be to impose too heavy a burden on the company and one that would seriously interfere with the rights, not only of the company, but of the public as well. The delay incident to the movement of trains would be intolerable. For another reason it is equally true that there can be no recovery by the plaintiffs in this case. The negligence alleged is the negligence of the train crew in not extinguishing the fire. This duty was not within the scope of employment of the train crew. They were employed for the purpose of operating the train and moving it from one destination to another. Their employment related wholly to the movement of the trains. Their duties were confined to this and to this alone. It could not be successfully alleged that the terms of their employment contemplated the performance of any such duties as that of extinguishing fires. It is a well-recognized principle of the law of negligence that an employer is not liable for any act or omission of the employee that is not within the scope of his employment. *Guille v. Campbell*, 200 Pa. 119, 49 Atl. 938, 86 Am. St. Rep. 705; *Lake Shore & Michigan Southern Railway Co. v. Rosenzweig*, 113 Pa. 519, 6 Atl. 545; *Rudgeair v. Reading Traction Co.*, 180 Pa. 333, 36 Atl. 859."